

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of this Amendment under Rule 116, claims 2 and 14 are canceled, claims 1, 3-13, 15, 16, 20 and 21 are currently amended, and claims 22 and 23 are newly added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-13 and 15-23 are left pending.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 13, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,893,914 to Clapp (hereinafter "Clapp"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in view of the following.

Clapp is directed to a computerized document assembly system. A model template 40 (Clapp's Fig. 3) is formed of a sequence of sections. The system calls the system for processing. Simultaneously with the calling of the template, an accompanying decision index 70 (Clapp's Fig. 4) associated with the template is also called. (c.4, ll.15-17) In this manner, the template 40 is associated with decisional options 42-62, including clause repeats 48 and conditional clauses 54 and questions to be answered 52. The foregoing clause repeats, conditional clauses and other questions are answered by a user, and used to assemble a document. An exemplary assembled document is a legal document, such as a "Special Power of Attorney" provided in Clapp's Fig. 16.

During operation, Clapp's system presents a portion of the template 40 on the screen 110 of display 20 (see Fig. 1), as illustrated in Clapp's Fig. 6, and the system receives the user's answers to an exemplary question blank 42. Each of the questions posed to a user is associated with an identifier, such as items 72, 74, 82 of Clapp's Fig. 4, or items 100 of Clapp's Fig. 5. The user's answers are stored in answer index 99 (Clapp's Fig. 5, col. 6, l.1). The portion of the template including the user's answers is displayed for the user (Clapp's Fig. 8, c.6, ll.9-15).

Clapp's system merges with each displayed section 110 (or part thereof) the answers corresponding to each displayed section 99 (or part thereof). It then combines and redisplay, in sequence, each displayed merged section (or part thereof) in order to assemble a document (for example, the "Special Power of Attorney" of Fig. 16) from the model template. (Abstract, c.8, ll.21-26) Clapp describes the operation of the system with respect to Fig. 20, which references Figs. 21 and 22. The disclosure relating to Fig. 21 teaches setting start and end parameters, whereas the

disclosure relating to Fig. 22 teaches how combining is performed, in relation to the aforementioned combining step.

As presently claimed, Applicant's invention of claims 1 recites "analyzing and dividing [an] input electronic document into a plurality of information units. " The claim further recites "extracting from [the] input electronic document, for each said information unit, location information relating to data included in the information unit indicating a location of an information source external to the input electronic document." (Applicant's claim 13 discloses the foregoing recitation by way of method.)

Clapp simply does not meet the foregoing recitation. For Clapp to anticipate Applicant's claims 1, 13, Clapp's disclosure of decisional options 42, 44 of template 40 would have to qualify as Applicant's recitation of information units, and template 40, itself, would have to qualify as Applicant's recited electronic document . However, under such construction, Clapp would lack any hint or suggestion of location information that relates to data included in the information unit, and that indicates a location of an information source external to the template. There is simply no equivalent in Clapp, as the decision indices 72, 74 (Clapp's Fig. 4) are used to store possible user decisions, and the answer indices 100 (Clapp's Fig. 5) are used to store the decisions specified by the user, with neither qualifying as location information related in any way to a source external to the template.

Applicant's claimed invention of claim 1 also recites "an external data acquisition section" that "acquir[es] external data for each [] information unit from [the] information source . . . based on the extracted location information." (Applicant's claim 13 discloses the foregoing recitation by way of method.)

As noted, for Clapp to anticipate, Clapp's disclosure of decisional options 42, 44 would have to qualify as Applicant's recitation of information units. However, under such construction, nowhere does Clapp hint or suggest acquiring any external data, for each such decisional option, from any information source. As apparent from Clapp's disclosure, decisional indices 42, 44 and decisional index answers 100 come from the template 40, not external data. Accordingly, Clapp fails to disclose acquiring such external data that is based on the decisional options, and thus, Clapp cannot anticipate claims 1, 3, 4, 13, 18 and 19, as it fails to recite each and every feature of the claim.

The claim further recites that the external data acquisition section "determine[es] whether the

external data acquired from [the] information source for each [] information unit relates to [the] data included in [the] information unit. (Applicant's claim 13 discloses the foregoing recitation by way of method.)

Again, using the only conceivable construction, there is no hint, teaching or suggestion in Clapp of determining whether any relationship exists between data acquired from an external source, which in itself is not disclosed by Clapp, and the data included in an information unit. For such construction to apply, Clapp's disclosure of decisional options 42, 44 would have to qualify as Applicant's recitation of information units, and Clapp's disclosure of indices (for example, 72, 74, 100) would have to qualify as Applicant's recitation of data acquired from an external source. However, as noted, Clapp's decisional indices alphanumerically represent decision options 42, 44, and Clapp's answer index 99 specifies the indices 100 chosen by the user, as shown in field 102. It is never taught by Clapp and would hardly make reasonable sense to compare the decisional options with the indices, as the relationship therebetween has been pre-established. As cited by Applicant, a part of information or text until a next paragraph or next title symbol appears may be set as an information unit. Accordingly, Applicant's invention does not require use of parentheses, identifiers, for example A1.1, or other similar indicia.

Applicant's claim 1 also recites "an information addition section" which "generat[es] additional data to be added to [the] electronic document using the acquired external data if [the foregoing] relation is found." For the foregoing reasons, such relation is neither found, nor can it reasonably exist. (Applicant's claim 13 discloses the foregoing recitation by way of method.)

Claims 3, 4, 18 and 19 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable independent claim, namely claims 1 and 13.

The Office Action also makes the following rejections: (i) claims 5 and 6 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,356,922 to Schilit. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection; (ii) claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,484,178 to Bence; (iii) claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,683 to Kanno; (iv) claim 10 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0143742 to Nonomura; (v) claim 11 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Nonomura and

U.S. Patent No. 6,760,694 to Al-Kazily; (vi) claims 12 and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,458 to Maeda; (vii) claims 14-16 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of Bence and U.S. Patent No. 6,356,622 to Howard; and (viii) claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clapp in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,415,278 to Sweet.

With respect the foregoing numerous rejections under 35 USC § 103(a), Applicants defer to Applicants' previous remarks made in association therewith, included in Applicant's former Amendment and Response. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the foregoing rejections use the Clapp reference as primary reference, which for the numerous reasons set forth hereinabove, fails to anticipate independent base claims 1, 13, from which all claims rejected pursuant to 35 USC § 103(a) depend.

Accordingly, the foregoing rejections should be withdrawn. All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and notice to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

Respectfully submitted,



Cameron H. Tousi

Registration No.: 43,197

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, D.C. 20043-9998

Telephone: (202) 344-4000

Telefax: (202) 344-8300

Date: November 8, 2006

MAS/CHT

DC2-800502